

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the insightful office action and for the telephone interview October 28, 2004. These remarks will start by summarizing the telephone interview, then summarizing the cited prior art and the submitted prior art from the Applicant's perspective, and
5 then remark on the Claims in detail.

Summary of the telephone interview: I called the Examiner primarily to inform him of the large IDS, which was filed in the last few days. There are two distinct web snapshots included in the material. One was taken roughly two months before the filing date of the application. The other was
10 taken earlier this month, which is more than a year after the filing date. Because the date when the web site content was first publicly disclosed, and based upon the recommendation of the Patent and Trademark Office, these materials were included. While I briefly touched upon the Claims, this amendment is the full and detailed response to the Office Action.

Summary of the Cited Prior Art: The Applicant finds **Notargiacomo US Application 2003/0009461** does not provide any discussion of the claimed matters. Some forms of a terminal service organization are called out, such as a funeral home. However the terminal service organization does not refer the customer to a web service. Without that referral, the Applicant does not find an avenue for such a referral taking place. Further, the non-existent avenue cannot identify
15 the terminal service organization to the web service.
20

The Applicant believes the customer cannot use the non-existent avenue to engage the web-service to provide at least one web-service product customized by at least one instruction from the customer, to create web-site revenue for the web-service. The Applicant does not find any discussion
25 of web-site revenue for the web-service. Consequently, the Applicant cannot find any discussion of the terminal service organization receiving an organization revenue based upon the customer using the non-existent avenue to create an unmentioned web-site revenue.

The Applicant finds the other cited prior art deficit in these same elements as
30 Notargiacomo.

Summary of the Submitted Prior Art: The Applicant finds does not provide any discussion of the following. Some forms of a terminal service organization are called out, such as a funeral home. However the terminal service organization does not refer a customer to a web service. Without that referral, the Applicant does not find an avenue for such a referral. Further, the non-existent avenue cannot identify the terminal service organization to the web service.

The Applicant believes the customer cannot use the non-existent avenue to engage the web-service to provide at least one web-service product customized by at least one instruction from the customer, to create web-site revenue for the web-service. The Applicant cannot find any discussion of the terminal service organization receiving an organization revenue based upon the customer using the non-existent avenue to create an unmentioned web-site revenue.

The Applicant finds that the cited and submitted prior art, whether taken individually or in combination neither disclose nor suggest the elements of the claimed invention.

Discussion of the Claims: The Claims have not been amended.

The Examiner has rejected **Claim 1** as anticipated under 35 USC §102 by Notargiacomo. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Looking at all the prior art, the Applicant finds the following. The terminal service organization does not refer the customer to a web service. Without that referral, the Applicant does not find an avenue for such a referral taking place. Further, the non-existent avenue cannot identify the terminal service organization to the web service.

The Applicant believes the customer cannot use the non-existent avenue to engage the web-service to provide at least one web-service product customized by at least one instruction from the customer, to create web-site revenue for the web-service. The Applicant cannot find any discussion of the terminal service organization receiving an organization revenue based upon the customer using the non-existent avenue to create a web-site revenue.

Based upon the above argument, the Applicant finds this Claim allowable.

Claims 2 to 17 are dependent upon Claim 1. These Claims have been rejected for the same reason.

5 Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

10 

15 Earle Jennings
8 Kenyon Ave.
Kensington, CA 94708

Registration No: 44,804
Phone: (510) 559-9074
FAX: (510) 559-2970
Email: ewj@ix.netcom.com